arXiv:1605.05715v1 [stat.ME] 18 May 2016

A Generalized Levene's Scale Test for Variance Heterogeneity in the Presence of Sample Correlation and Group Uncertainty

David Soave[1,2,*] and Lei Sun[3,1,]**

[1]Division of Biostatistics, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5T 3M7, Canada

[2]Program in Genetics and Genome Biology, Research Institute, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON M5G 0A4, Canada

[3]Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 3G3, Canada

[*] *email:* david.soave@mail.utoronto.ca

[**] *email:* sun@utstat.toronto.edu

SUMMARY: We generalize Levene's test for variance (scale) heterogeneity between k groups for more complex data, which includes sample correlation and group membership uncertainty. Following a two-stage regression framework, we show that least absolute deviation regression must be used in the stage 1 analysis to ensure a correct asymptotic $\chi^2_{k-1}/(k-1)$ distribution of the generalized scale (gS) test statistic. We then show that the proposed gS test is independent of the generalized location test, under the joint null hypothesis of no mean and no variance heterogeneity. Consequently, we generalize the recently proposed joint location-scale ($gJLS$) test valuable in settings where there is an interaction effect, but one interacting variable is not available. We evaluate the proposed method via an extensive simulation study, and two genetic association application studies.

KEY WORDS: Heteroscedasticity; Scale test; Joint location-scale test; Association studies.

1. Introduction

Testing for scale (variance) heterogeneity, prior to the main inference of location (mean) parameters, is a common diagnostic method in linear regression to evaluate the assumption of homoscedasticity. In some research areas, such as statistical genetics, testing for heteroscedasticity itself can be of primary interest.

With the goal of detecting a genetic association between a single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP, G) and a quantitative outcome (phenotype, Y), the traditional approach is to conduct a location test, testing mean differences in Y across the three genotype groups of the SNP ($G = 0$, 1 or 2 copies of the minor allele, the variant with population frequency < 0.5). However, it has been noted that a number of biologically meaningful scenarios can lead to variance differences in Y across the genotype groups of a SNP of interest (say G_1). For example, an underlying interaction effect between G_1 and another SNP G_2 (G_1xG_2) or an environmental factor E (G_1xE), on Y can lead to heteroscedasticity across G_1 if the interacting G_2 or E variable is not collected to directly model the interaction term (Pare et al., 2010). Transformations on a phenotype can also result in variance heterogeneity (Sun et al., 2013). This transformation can occur knowingly for statistical purposes, e.g. $\log(Y)$, or unknowingly, e.g. choosing a phenotype measurement that does not directly represent the true underlying biological outcome of a gene. In each of these scenarios, a scale test can be used either alone to indirectly detect associated SNPs (Pare et al., 2010), or combined with a location test to increase testing power (Cao et al., 2014; Soave et al., 2015).

Genotype uncertainty is inherent in both sequenced and imputed SNP data. For these types of data, the genotype of a SNP for an individual ($G = 0$, 1 or 2) is represented by three genotype probabilities (p_0, p_1, p_2, and $p_0 + p_1 + p_2 = 1$). For testing methods that require genotype to be known unambiguously, the probabilistic data are typically transformed into the so-called "best-guess" (most likely or hard-call) genotype, crudely selected as the

one with the largest probability. In the context of location-testing, several groups have proposed methods that incorporate the probabilistic data and showed that this improves power (Acar and Sun, 2013; Kutalik et al., 2011). The corresponding development for scale-testing, however, is lacking.

Genetic association studies often involve family data, where individuals in a sample are correlated or clustered. In addition, unintentional correlation due to cryptic relatedness may be revealed from standard quality control analyses of a population sample of presumed unrelated individuals (Sun and Dimitromanolakis, 2012). A number of generalized location tests allowing for family data have been proposed (Horvath et al., 2001; Jakobsdottir and McPeek, 2013), and their power gain over analyzing only the subset of independent individuals is a direct consequence of the increase in sample size. However, few scale tests deal with correlated data, with the exception of methods proposed specifically for clustered data present in twin studies (Haseman and Elston, 1970; Iachine et al., 2010). Further, these methods have been reported to have type 1 error issues in the presence of non-normal data or small, unequal group sizes (Iachine et al., 2010), and they have not been extended to incorporate group membership uncertainty.

Both classical statistical tests and graphical procedures have been proposed to investigate heteroscedasticity (Bartlett, 1937; Breusch and Pagan, 1979; Cook and Weisberg, 1983; Levene, 1960; White, 1980). In big data settings, such as genome-wide association studies, where possibly millions of SNPs are scanned for association with an outcome, graphical and other computationally burdensome approaches are undesirable. Levene's test (Levene, 1960) is known for its simplicity and robustness to modelling assumptions, and it is perhaps the most popular method for evaluating variance heterogeneity between k groups. Therefore, our development here focuses on Levene's method.

In this paper, we extend Levene's test for equality of variances across k groups to allow

for both group membership uncertainty and sample correlation. When groups are known, we show that the proposed method outperforms existing methods for clustered twin data. In the presence of group uncertainty, we demonstrate that our test continues to be accurate and has improved power over the "best-guess" approach. This generalized scale test can be used alone for heteroscedasticity diagnostic purposes but with wider applicability. Motivated by the complex genetic association studies described above, we also show that the proposed gS test can be combined with existing generalized location tests using the joint location-scale framework, previously developed for population samples without group uncertainty (Soave et al., 2015), to further improve power. Finally, we apply our methods to two genetic association studies, one of HbA1c levels in individuals with type 1 diabetes, and the other of lung disease in individuals with cystic fibrosis.

2. Methodology

We first consider a sample of independent observations with no group uncertainty, and formulate Levene's test as a regression problem. Using this regression framework, we then extend Levene's test as the generalized scale (gS hereinafter) test to allow for sample dependency and group uncertainty. For clarity of the methods comparison, we also briefly discuss the Iachine et al. (2010) extension of Levene's test, specifically designed for twin pairs without group uncertainty. Finally, we generalize the joint location-scale test of Soave et al. (2015) ($gJLS$) for the complex data structure considered here.

2.1 *Notation and Statistical Model*

Let $y_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$, be a sample of independent observations, where each $y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$. Suppose the y_i's fall into k distinct treatment groups with group-specific variance σ_j^2, $j = 1, \ldots, k$, and let n_j be the sample size for group j, $n = \sum n_j$. Our motivation concerns

testing the hypothesis of equal variance across the k groups:

$$H_0 : \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \cdots = \sigma_k^2. \tag{1}$$

For notation concision, here we use σ_j^2 for group-specific variance, $j = 1, \ldots, k$, and σ_i^2 for observation-specific variance, $i = 1, \ldots, n$; in what follows we make the distinction clear in the context.

Let $x_{ji}, j = 1, \ldots, k-1$, be the standard dummy variables, where $(x_{1i} = 0, \ldots, x_{(k-1)i} = 0)$ for observation i belonging to group 1, and $(x_{1i} = 0, \ldots, x_{(j-1)i} = 1, \ldots, x_{(k-1)i} = 0)$ for group j, $j = 2, \ldots, k$.

Consider the normal linear model of interest here,

$$\begin{aligned} y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \cdots + \beta_{k-1} x_{(k-1)i} + \varepsilon_i, \\ i = 1, \ldots, n, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$, σ_i^2 corresponds to the variance associated with the group that y_i belongs to. In other words, $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma_{j^*}^2$ if $x_{(j^*-1)i} = 1$. In matrix notation,

$$\boldsymbol{y} = X\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \tag{3}$$

where X is the design matrix obtained by stacking the $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T = (1, x_{1i}, x_{2i}, \ldots, x_{(k-1)i})$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, and Σ is the covariance matrix with diagonal elements σ_i^2s.

2.2 *Formulating Levene's Test as a Regression F-test and Modifications*

The classical formulation of Levene's test first centres the observations, y_i's, by their estimated group means and obtains the corresponding absolute deviations, d_i's. It then tests for mean differences in the d_i's across the k groups using ANOVA. Let $I_{ij}, j = 1, \ldots, k$ be the group indicator variables, where $I_{ij} = 1$ if individual i belongs to group j. Now, let $\overline{\mu_{(j)}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i I_{ij}/n_j$ be the estimated group means of the y_i's, such that an estimate of $E(y_i)$ is $\overline{\mu_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} I_{ij}\overline{\mu_{(j)}}$. The corresponding absolute deviations are

$$d_i = |y_i - \overline{\mu_i}|.$$

Let $\overline{d_{(j)}}$ be the estimated group means of the d_i's, such that an estimate of $E(d_i)$ is $\overline{d_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} I_{ij}\overline{d_{(j)}}$, and let $\overline{\overline{d}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i/n$ be the grand mean. Finally, Levene's test statistic has the following form

$$F(\boldsymbol{d}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\overline{d_i} - \overline{\overline{d}})^2/(k-1)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(d_i - \overline{d_i})^2/(n-k)},$$

where $F(\boldsymbol{d})$ follows approximately an $F(k-1, n-k)$ distribution under the null hypothesis of (1), and a $\chi^2_{k-1}/(k-1)$ distribution asymptotically as $n \to \infty$.

For the purpose of a unified development, it is prudent to re-formulate Levene's test using the following two-stage regression framework:

Stage 1.1. Obtain the residuals, $\widehat{\varepsilon}_i = y_i - \widehat{y}_i = y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, from the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression of y_i on $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T$; we refer to this as the *stage 1* regression.

Stage 1.2. Take the absolute values of these residuals, d_i=$|\widehat{\varepsilon}_i|$.

Stage 2. Test for an association between the d_i's and $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T$'s using a regression F-test; we refer to this as the *stage 2* regression and test.

The justification for this two-stage regression procedure (Levene's test) being a test of the hypothesis of variance homogeneity (1) is as follows. Stage 1 performs OLS regression using a working covariance matrix $\Sigma_{stage\,1} = \sigma_y^2 I$, where I is the identity matrix. Therefore $\widehat{\boldsymbol{y}} = X(X^TX)^{-1}X^Ty = Hy$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \boldsymbol{y} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{y}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}, \Sigma(I-H))$ and $\widehat{\varepsilon}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2(1-h_{ii}))$, where h_{ii} is the ith diagonal element of the hat matrix H. Consequently $d_i = |\widehat{\varepsilon}_i|$ follows a folded-normal distribution and its mean is a linear function of σ_i,

$$E(d_i) = \sigma_i\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}(1-h_{ii})}.$$

This relationship between d_i and σ_i is approximated by the following working model in stage 2,

$$d_i = \alpha + \gamma_1 x_{1i} + \gamma_2 x_{2i} + \cdots + \gamma_{k-1}x_{(k-1)i} + e_i, \tag{4}$$

where $e_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_d^2)$. In matrix form,

$$\boldsymbol{d} = X\boldsymbol{\theta} + \boldsymbol{e}, \tag{5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\alpha, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T)^T = (\alpha, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{k-1})^T$, and $\boldsymbol{e} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{stage\,2}), \Sigma_{stage\,2} = \sigma_d^2 I$. Testing the null hypothesis (1) is now re-formulated as testing

$$H_0 : \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \cdots = \gamma_{k-1} = 0, \tag{6}$$

using the classical OLS regression F-test. Note that although the d_i's are folded normal variables, Levene's variance test takes advantage of the fact that inference from OLS regression is robust to violations of the normality assumption.

This formulation of Levene's test has a similar structure to the score test of Glejser (1969) proposed for testing heterscedasticity associated with continuous covariates. Godfrey (1996) showed that when estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by OLS in the stage 1 regression, the resulting Glejser score statistic derived from the stage 2 regression analysis is not asymptotically distributed as χ_1^2, unless the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is symmetric. To achieve robustness, several modifications have been proposed (Brown and Forsythe, 1974; Im, 2000; Machado and Silva, 2000; Furno, 2005; Gastwirth et al., 2009), among which replacing sample group means with medians in constructing the d_i's is most intuitive. This substitution has been consistently recommended in the literature for its robustness against non-normality (Conover et al., 1981; Lim and Loh, 1996). It has also been shown analytically that, when the distribution of the error $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is not symmetric, centering on the sample group medians, and not the means, will lead to an asymptotically correct Levene's test (Carroll and Schneider, 1985) and correct Glejser's score test (Furno, 2005). In the regression framework, this modification corresponds to estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by least absolute deviation (LAD) regression instead of OLS regression in stage 1.

2.3 *The Generalized Levene's Scale (gS) Test*

The above regression framework for Levene's test allows us to incorporate group uncertainty by simply replacing the group indicators or dummy variables for each observation, $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T$, with

the corresponding group probabilities. Analogous to dummy variables, the group probabilities for each individual sum to 1, so we omit one of the covariates to ensure model identifiability. Using genetic association as an example again, let $(p_0 = 0.25, p_1 = 0.42, p_2 = 0.33)$ be the genotype probabilities for an individual i at a SNP of interest, then, without loss of generality, we can define $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T = (1, x_{1i}, x_{2i}) = (1, 0.42, 0.33)$. Note that the "best-guess" approach would have the corresponding covariate vector as $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T = (1, 1, 0)$.

Now, consider correlated data where ε_i and ε_j are no longer independent of each other and the covariance matrix Σ is no longer diagonal. In the stage 1 regression, because we are only interested in obtaining $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ to construct $d_i = |y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}|$, we can continue to use OLS or LAD regression with the misspecified working covariance matrix, $\Sigma_{stage\,1} = \sigma_y^2 I$, to obtain consistent and unbiased $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ estimates.

Stage 2 involves estimating the variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ to test the null hypothesis of (6), and not accounting for sample dependency can lead to invalid inference. Let $\Sigma_{stage\,2} = \sigma_d^2\Sigma_d$; a valid inference can be achieved by using a generalized least squares (GLS) approach when Σ_d is known (Aitken, 1936). When Σ_d is unknown, feasible GLS (FGLS) (Baltagi, 2008) can be used, with or without iteration, where an estimate of Σ_d is obtained, subject to constraints, and then used in GLS. Alternatively, orthogonal-triangular decomposition methods can be used to obtain a compact representation of the profiled log-likelihood, such that maximum likelihood estimates (MLE's) of all parameters can be obtained jointly through nonlinear optimization (Pinheiro and Bates, 2000).

In many scientific settings, including genetic association studies, the sample correlation structure is often specified with constraints on the $n(n-1)/2$ correlations, e.g. a single serial correlation ρ for time series or family data with a single relationship type (e.g. twin data), or different cluster-specific correlations ρ's for different clusters. In this case, let $\Sigma_{stage\,2} =$

$\sigma_d^2\Sigma_d(\rho) = \sigma_d^2 C(\rho)C(\rho)^T$ be the Cholesky decomposition, and define

$$\boldsymbol{d}^* = C(\rho)^{-1}\boldsymbol{d},\ X^* = C(\rho)^{-1}X,\ \boldsymbol{e}^* = C(\rho)^{-1}\boldsymbol{e}$$

The GLS or FGLS regression, in essence, deals with the transformed model in stage 2

$$\boldsymbol{d^*} = X^*\boldsymbol{\theta} + \boldsymbol{e^*}, \tag{7}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\alpha, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T)^T$. For a fixed ρ, the conditional MLEs for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and σ_d^2 are

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = [X^{*T}X^*]^{-1}X^{*T}\boldsymbol{d}^*,\ \widehat{\sigma_d^2} = \frac{1}{n}\left\|\boldsymbol{d}^* - X^*\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\|^2.$$

The MLE of ρ can be obtained by optimizing the profiled log-likelihood,

$$l(\rho) = \text{constant} - n\log\left\|\boldsymbol{d}^*(\rho) - X^*(\rho)\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho)\right\| - \frac{1}{2}log|C(\rho)|.$$

Thus, the generalized Levene's scale gS test of the null hypothesis of (6), $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{0}$, using the regression F-test in stage 2, has the following test statistic:

$$F(\boldsymbol{d}^*) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n(\widehat{d_i^*} - \widetilde{d_i^*})^2/(k-1)}{\sum_{i=1}^n(d_i^* - \widehat{d_i^*})^2/(n-k)}, \tag{8}$$

where $\widehat{d_i^*} = (\boldsymbol{x}_i^*)^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, the predicted values from regression model (7), and $\widetilde{d_i^*} = 1_i^*\widetilde{\alpha}$, the predicted values from the regression of $\boldsymbol{d}^*$ on $\mathbf{1}^*$. Note that $\mathbf{1}^*$ is the first column of the transformed design matrix X^*, and may not be a vector of 1's. When the observations are independent of each other and group membership is known unambiguously, it is easy to verify that $\widehat{d_i^*} = \overline{d_i}$ and $\widetilde{d_i^*} = \overline{\overline{d}}$, and $F(\boldsymbol{d^*})$ reduces to the original form of $F(\boldsymbol{d})$.

Under the linear regression model of (4), the F-statistic (8) of testing (6) is asymptotically $\chi^2_{k-1}/(k-1)$ distributed (Arnold, 1980). However, similar to the results of Carroll and Schneider (1985) and Furno (2005) for the original Levene's test, we show that for non-symmetric $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, this is true only when $\boldsymbol{d}$ is estimated using LAD in the stage 1 regression (Web Appendix A, Theorem 1).

2.4 *The Iachine et al. (2010) Scale Test for Twin Pairs and Modifications*

Focusing on paired-observations, Iachine et al. (2010) extended Levene's test to determine if the variance of an outcome differs between monozygotic (MZ) and dizygotic (DZ) twin

pairs. The proposed twin (TW) test follows Levene's two-stage regression procedure but it makes use of the Huber-White sandwich estimate (White, 1980) of $\text{Var}(\widehat{\gamma}_1)$ in the stage 2 analysis (here $k = 2$ requiring only one dummy variable) to construct an asymptotically χ^2_1 distributed Wald statistic, operationally an F-statistic in finite samples.

Complications with the TW test may arise if the number of clusters is small in either group (MZ or DZ) and can be compounded with imbalance between the groups (Iachine et al., 2010). Unfortunately, there is no clear definition of too few clusters (Cameron and Miller, 2013), and empirical type 1 error rates can be inflated for study designs with less than 20 clusters per group, particularly combined with non-symmetric data (see Iachine et al. (2010) and simulation results Section 3 below).

The original TW method assumes that if two observations are from the same pair/cluster they also belong to the same group k. This may not be satisfied in a more general setting like the genetic association studies discussed above. For example, two individuals from the same DZ pair or familial cluster often have different genotypes at a SNP of interest, so individuals from the same cluster may not share a common σ^2_k. However, the sandwich variance estimator can continue to be used in this setting. In the presence of group uncertainty, the TW method can be modified by replacing the group indicator covariate with group probabilities.

2.5 *Generalized Joint Location-Scale (gJLS) testing*

The standard location test of mean differences in an (approximately) normally distributed outcome across covariate values (e.g. the three genotype groups of a SNP in a genetic association study) is testing

$$H_0^{location} : \beta_1 = \ldots = \beta_{k-1} = 0,$$

based on regression model (2). While the location test performs a hypothesis test on the β_j's, the scale test discussed here uses only the β estimates from the stage 1 regression of model (2) to obtain $d_i = |y_i - \widehat{y}_i|$ for the stage 2 regression of model (4), and it performs a

hypothesis test on the γ_j's, testing

$$H_0^{scale} : \gamma_1 = \ldots = \gamma_{k-1} = 0.$$

A joint location-scale (JLS) test is interested in the following global null hypothesis,

$$H_0^{joint} : \beta_j = 0, \text{ and } \gamma_j = 0, \forall \ j = 1, \ldots, k-1. \tag{9}$$

One simple yet powerful JLS method proposed in Soave et al. (2015) uses Fisher's method to combine p_L and p_S, the p-values of the individual location and scale tests. One can consider other aggregation statistics, e.g. the minimal p-value (Derkach et al., 2013, 2014); for a review of this topic see Owen (2009) and Marozzi (2013). Focusing on Fisher's method, the corresponding test statistic is

$$W_F = -2(log(p_L) + log(p_S)).$$

For independent observations with no group uncertainty, Soave et al. (2015) showed that, under H_0^{joint} of (9) and a Gaussian model, p_L and p_S are independent. Thus W_F is distributed as a χ^2_4 random variable.

In the presence of sample correlation with group uncertainty, we propose to use the same framework but obtain p_L from a generalized location test (e.g. a generalized least squares approach to model (2), where the design matrix X includes the group probabilities, and the covariance matrix, $\Sigma_{stage\,1} = \sigma_y^2 \Sigma_y$, incorporates the sample correlation), and p_S from the gS test proposed here. We show that the assumption of independence between p_L and p_S continues to hold theoretically under H_0^{joint} of (9) for normally distributed outcomes (Web Appendix B), as well as empirically for approximately normally distributed outcomes in finite samples (Web Figure 1).

3. Simulations

The validity of the generalized joint location-scale ($gJLS$) testing procedure relies on the accuracy of the individual generalized location (gL) test and generalized scale (gS) test com-

ponents. The performance of the gL test has been established in the literature, therefore, our simulation studies here focused on evaluation of the proposed gS test, and when appropriate compared it with Levene's original test (Lev) and the TW test of Iachine et al. (2010). We use subscripts $_{OLS}$ and $_{LAD}$ to denote if the stage 1 regression was performed using OLS to obtain group-*mean*-adjusted residuals or LAD for group-*median*-adjusted residuals. Implementation details of each of the six tests (Lev_{OLS}, Lev_{LAD}, TW_{OLS}, TW_{LAD}, gS_{OLS},gS_{LAD}) is outlined in Web Appendix C.

We considered two main simulation models. Simulation model 1 followed the exact simulation setup of Iachine et al. (2010) to ensure fair comparison. Simulation model 2 extended model 1 by introducing genotype groups for each individual as well as group membership uncertainty. To apply the original Lev test for comparison, we ignored the inherent sample correlation in the presence of correlated data. In all simulations, empirical type 1 error and power were evaluated at the 5% significance level using 10,000 replicates, unless otherwise stated.

3.1 *Simulation Model 1*

3.1.1 *Model Setup.* Following the exact simulation study design of Iachine et al. (2010), we simulated correlated outcome values for n_1 MZ twin pairs and n_2 DZ twin pairs, $n = 2n_1 + 2n_2$, and we tested if the variance of the outcome differed between the two groups of pairs, i.e. $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$. To study robustness, we simulated outcomes using Gaussian, Students t_4 (heavier tailed), and χ_4^2 (non-symmetric) distributions.

We first generated pairs of observations from independent bivariate normal distributions $BV\mathcal{N}(0, 1, \rho_k), k = 1, 2$, with ρ_1 and ρ_2 corresponding to the correlation within the MZ and DZ twin pairs, respectively. Let w be the variable for an observation, we then applied a transformation $g(\cdot)$ to w to obtain the desired marginal distribution, $y = \sigma_k g(w)$, where the σ_k's induced different variances between the two groups. The choice of $g(\cdot)$ depended on the

desired distribution for y:

$$g(w) = \begin{cases} w, & \text{if } y \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1) \\ F_{t_4}^{-1}(\Phi(w)), & \text{if } y \sim t_4 \\ F_{\chi_4^2}^{-1}(\Phi(w)), & \text{if } y \sim \chi_4^2 \end{cases},$$

where Φ, F_{t_4} and $F_{\chi_4^2}$ are the cumulative distribution functions for the standard normal, Students t_4 and χ_4^2 distributions, respectively.

We varied the sample size ($n_1, n_2 = 5$, 10 or 20 for small samples, and = 500, 1000 or 2000 for large samples, and n_1 may or may not equal n_2), and group variances ($\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2 = 1$, 2 or 4). The level of correlation within the MZ and DZ twin pairs was $\rho_1 = 0.75$ and $\rho_2 = 0.5$, respectively.

3.1.2 *Results.* We were able to replicate the simulation results of Iachine et al. (2010) that studied Lev_{OLS}, Lev_{LAD}, TW_{OLS}, and TW_{LAD} (Table 1 and Web Table 1). However, we noticed that results reported in their paper for Lev_{LAD} and TW_{LAD} using median-adjusted residuals (labeled as W_{50} and TW_{50}, columns 9 and 12 of Tables 1-4 in Iachine et al. (2010)) were mistakenly replaced by the Lev and TW results obtained using 10% trimmed mean-adjusted residuals (labeled as W_{10} and TW_{10} in Iachine et al. (2010)). Subsequent conclusions in Iachine et al. (2010) that the TW method using the 10% trimmed mean "performed best", therefore, are incorrect and should instead refer to TW_{LAD} using median-adjusted residuals from the stage 1 regression.

Our results in Table 1 clearly show that

- In the presence of sample correlation, Levene's original method Lev that ignores the correlation had severely increased type 1 error rate, even with Gaussian data. That is, TW and gS performed better than Lev.
- When the error structure was non-symmetric (χ_4^2) or the group sizes were small (e.g. n_1 or n_2 less than 20), using OLS in the stage 1 regression for either TW or gS led to

increased type 1 error. That is, TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} performed better than TW_{OLS} and gS_{OLS}, respectively.

- When the group sizes were unbalanced and small (e.g. $n_1 = 10, n_2 = 20$), TW_{LAD} had increased type 1 error, even with Gaussian data. That is, gS_{LAD} performed better than TW_{LAD}.

In large samples, the original *Lev* test remained too optimistic, with an empirical α of 0.097 when $n_1 = n_2 = 2000$ with Gaussian data (Web Table 1). The accuracy of both TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} increased as sample size increased, with empirical α of 0.052 when $n_1 = n_2 = 2000$, even for the non-symmetric χ^2_4 data. The accuracy of both TW_{OLS} and gS_{OLS} also improved as sample size increased, however, only for symmetric Gaussian or t_4 data. For χ^2_4 data, their empirical α level remained as high as 0.103 when $n_1 = n_2 = 2000$; this empirical result is consistent with Theorem 1 (Web Appendix A).

Because most of the six tests did not have good type 1 error control in the presence of sample correlation, small samples, unbalanced group sizes, or non-symmetric data, we delay the discussion of power until simulation model 2 below where we focus on methods comparison between TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD}, and in a more general simulation set-up.

3.2 *Simulation Model 2*

3.2.1 *Model Setup.* The second simulation setup was motivated by genetic association studies as previously discussed. We again considered sibling pairs to introduce sample correlation. However, unlike simulation model 1, here we allowed individuals from the same pair/cluster to belong to different groups, where the groups were the different genotypes of a SNP of interest.

Consider a SNP of interest with minor allele frequency (MAF) of q (= 0.2 or 0.1), we first simulated genotypes for $n/2$ (= 20, 50, 100, 500 or 1000) pairs of siblings. To account for the inherent correlation of genotypes between a pair of siblings, we started with drawing

the number of alleles shared identical by decent (IBD), $D = 0$, 1 or 2, from a multinomial distribution with parameters (0.25, 0.5, 0.25), independently for each sib-pair. Given the IBD status D, we then simulated paired genotypes $(G_1, G_2) = (i, j), i, j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, following the known conditional distribution of $\{(G_1, G_2)|D\}$ (Thompson, 1975; Sun, 2012). The distribution depends on q in a way that smaller q leads to greater imbalance in the genotype group sizes. Approximately, the distribution of the numbers of individuals with genotype $G = 0$, 1 and 2 is proportional to $(1-q)^2$, $2q(1-q)$ and q^2, respectively.

To introduce group membership uncertainty, we converted the simulated true genotypes G's to probabilistic data X's using a Dirichlet distribution. We used scale parameters a for the correct genotype category and $(1-a)/2$ for the other two; this error model was used previously by Acar and Sun (2013) to study location tests in the presence of genotype group uncertainty. We varied a from 1 to 0.5, where $a = 1$ corresponds to no genotype uncertainty and $a = 0.5$ implies that, on average, 50% of the "best-guess" genotypes correspond to the true genotype groups. Thus, the genotype group uncertainty level ranged from 0% to 50% in our simulations.

We then simulated outcome data for each sib-pair in a fashion similar to simulation model 1. For each of the $n/2$ sib-pairs, we first simulated paired data from $BV\mathcal{N}(0, 1, \rho)$, where $\rho = 0.5$ was the within sib-pair correlation. For each simulated value w, we then applied the $\sigma_k g(w)$ transformation to obtain the desired outcome data y as in simulation model 1 (Gaussian, Student's t_4, and χ^2_4). However, k here refers to the corresponding true underlying genotype group of an individual, and two individuals from the same sib-pair might not have the same genotype. We used $(\sigma_0^2, \sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2) = (1, 1, 1)$ to study type 1 error control, and $(1, 1.5, 2)$ or $(1, 2, 4)$ to study power; other values such as $(2, 1.5, 1)$ and $(4, 2, 1)$ were also considered.

It is evident from the results of simulation model 1 that the original *Lev* test is not valid in the presence of sample correlation, and TW_{OLS} and gS_{OLS} are inferior, respectively, to

TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD}, when the error structure is non-symmetric or the group sizes are small. Therefore, the results presented below focus on comparison between TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD}. In the presence of genotype group uncertainty, we also considered the "best-guess" approach and used TW^{BG}_{LAD} and gS^{BG}_{LAD} to represent the corresponding results.

3.2.2 *Results.* In the presence of sample correlation but with no group uncertainty, the results in Table 2 show that both TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} were accurate in large samples, e.g. when sample size was 2000 ($n/2 = 1000$ sib-pairs). However, TW_{LAD} had increased type 1 error when group sizes were unbalanced and relatively small, even for Gaussian data. For example, when the MAF is $q = 0.2$ and the number of sib-pairs is $n/2 = 100$, the expected sizes of the three genotype group sizes are $n * ((1-q)^2, 2q(1-q), q^2) = (128, 64, 8)$. In that case, the empirical type 1 error of TW_{LAD} was 0.060, 0.072 and 0.078 for Gaussian, t_4 and χ^2_4 data, respectively. The problem was exacerbated by a smaller MAF $q = 0.1$ with empirical type 1 error levels of 0.092, 0.115 and 0.118, respectively for the three types of data. In contrast, the proposed gS_{LAD} test remained accurate in most cases and was slightly conservative in small samples, when $n/2 < 100$.

Results in Table 3 are characteristically similar to those of Table 2. However, we note that group uncertainty somewhat mitigates the problem of unbalanced group sizes, and consequently the accuracy issue of TW_{LAD}. Nevertheless, it is clear that gS_{LAD} had better type 1 error control than TW_{LAD} across the MAF values and the three outcome distributions. As expected, TW^{BG}_{LAD} and gS^{BG}_{LAD} using the "best-guess" genotype group have similar type 1 error control to TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} incorporating the group probabilistic data, under the null hypothesis (Table 3 and Web Tables 2 and 3).

Focusing on the accurate gS_{LAD} test, Table 4 and Figure 1 demonstrate the gain in power when incorporating the group probabilistic data into the inference (gS_{LAD}) as compared to using the "best-guess" group (gS^{BG}_{LAD}). For example, at the 30% group uncertainty level with

sample size of 1000 ($n/2 = 500$ sib-pairs), MAF of 0.1 and under Gaussian data, the power of gS_{LAD} was 0.613, a 23% increase over the power of 0.495 observed for gS^{BG}_{LAD}; a similar gain in efficiency was observed for other sample sizes, MAF, and with t_4 and χ^4_2 data (Table 4).

One would expect the relative efficiency gain to increase as uncertainty level increases. However, this is true only if the uncertainty level is not too high. Depending on the model used to induce group uncertainty and the heteroscedasticity alternatives, it is reasonable to assume that the absolute power eventually converges to the type 1 error as the uncertainty increases. Consequently, the gain in relative efficiency of gS_{LAD} compared to gS^{BG}_{LAD} would also diminish and converge to 1. This is consistent with results in Figure 1.

4. Applications

To demonstrate the utility of the proposed generalized scale (gS) test and subsequent generalized joint location-scale ($gJLS$) test, we revisited the two genetic association studies considered in Soave et al. (2015), and compared our results with those using only a sample of unrelated individuals with no genotype group uncertainties. We also used application data combined with simulation methods to further empirically validate the performance of the proposed methods.

4.1 *HbA1c Levels in Subjects with Type 1 Diabetes*

We use this application to demonstrate the gain in power by incorporating group uncertainty (probabilistic) data. Details of this dataset were previously reported in Soave et al. (2015). Briefly, the outcome of interest was inverse normal transformed HbA1c levels in $n = 1304$ unrelated subjects with type 1 diabetes, and the SNP of interest was rs1358030 near *SORCS1* on chromosome 10 with MAF of 0.36. With no sample correlation or group uncertainty, the original *Lev* test for variance heterogeneity was applied and resulted in a significant result

with $p = 0.01$ (Soave et al., 2015). Combined with other evidence reported in Paterson et al. (2010), we assume here that the association is real and smaller p-values implies greater power.

To demonstrate the effect of genotype group uncertainty, we masked the true genotypes using the same Dirichlet distribution as in the simulation studies above, where the value of a ranged from 1 to 0.5, corresponding to no group uncertainty to 50% uncertainty. We then applied gS^{BG}_{LAD} to the "best-guess" genotype data and the proposed gS_{LAD} incorporating the probabilistic data, and obtained the corresponding p-values, $p_{gS^{BG}_{LAD}}$ and $p_{gS_{LAD}}$. For a given uncertainty level, we repeated the masking process independently 1,000 times and obtained averaged p-values on the log10 scale ($10^{\{\text{average of } log10(p)\}}$), $\overline{p}_{gS^{BG}_{LAD}}$ and $\overline{p}_{gS_{LAD}}$. Between the two methods, it was clear that gS_{LAD} was more efficient than gS^{BG}_{LAD}. For example, when $a = 0.75$ for 25% group uncertainty, the gS_{LAD} test remains significant with $\overline{p}_{gS_{LAD}} = 0.048$ as compared to $\overline{p}_{gS^{BG}_{LAD}} = 0.068$. Regardless of the method used, the power of the scale tests decreased sharply as genotype uncertainty increased, consistent with those for location tests reported in Acar and Sun (2013), where location tests incorporating group uncertainty were compared with the "best-guess" approach.

4.2 *Lung Disease in Subjects with Cystic Fibrosis*

We used this application to demonstrate the gain in power by incorporating all available subjects, including relatives. We also used this dataset combined with permutation methods to further demonstrate the validity of the proposed methods. Details of this dataset were previously reported in Soave et al. (2015). Briefly, the outcome of interest was lung function as measured by the normally distributed SaKnorm quantity (Taylor et al., 2011) in a total of $n_{all} = 1507$ individuals with CF, among which 1313 were singletons, 188 from 94 sib-pairs, and 6 from 2 sib-trios. In total, 8 SNPs from 3 genes (*SLC26A9*, *SLC9A3* and *SLC6A14*)

were analyzed based on association evidence for other CF-related outcomes reported in Sun et al. (2012) and Li et al. (2014).

Focusing on the $n_{indep} = 1313 + 94 + 2 = 1409$ unrelated individuals, Soave et al. (2015) analyzed the association between lung function and each of the 8 SNPs using the individual location test and scale test, as well as the joint location-scale (JLS) test. They reported that SNPs from *SLC9A3* and *SLC6A14* were associated with CF lung functions (Table 5).

The number of omitted subjects in that analysis was small ($n_{omit} = 94 + 2 * 2 = 98$) and consequently the expected loss of efficiency is anticipated to be small. Nevertheless, we re-analyzed the data available from the whole sample of $n_{all} = 1507$ individuals, using the individual generalized location (gL) test, the proposed generalized scale (gS) test, and the subsequent generalized joint location-scale ($gJLS$) test (Table 5). We used a compound symmetric correlation structure (a single correlation parameter ρ) to model within family dependence for each application of GLS regression.

We first note that the conclusions for the presumed null SNPs from *SLC26A9* did not change, as desired. The conclusions for the presumed associated SNPs from *SLC9A3* and *SLC6A14* did not change either, but using all available data led to smaller p-values for the gL test. The lack of apparent efficiency gain for gS was somewhat disappointing, but it was also expected given the few number of siblings added to the sample; see Discussion Section 5 for additional comments. Lastly, we note that the JLS framework indeed yields increased power when aggregating evidence from the individual tests; see Soave et al. (2015) for detailed discussions of the motivation and merits of the joint-testing framework.

To further exam the accuracy of the proposed gS and $gJLS$ tests (as well as the gL test for completeness), we generated 10,000 permutation replicates of the outcome to assess the empirical type 1 error control; permutation was performed separately between singletons and between sib-pairs; see Abney (2015) for permutation techniques for more general family

data. Without loss of generality, we focused on SNP rs17563161 from *SLC9A3* (Web Figure 1). Testing the resulting p-values for deviation from the expected Uniform(0,1) distribution using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that all tests were valid. Additional simulations for inducing genotype group uncertainty led to the same conclusion (results not shown).

5. Discussion

Levene's scale test is widely used as a model diagnostic tool in linear regression, and more recently it has been employed as an indirect test for interaction effects. Increased data complexity due to sample correlation or group uncertainty, however, limits its applicability. Here we proposed a generalization of Levene's scale test, gS, that has good type 1 error control in the presence of sample correlation, small samples, unbalanced group sizes, and non-symmetric outcome data. We showed that the least absolute deviation (LAD) regression approach to obtain group-*median*-adjusted residuals is needed to ensure robust performance of gS. Based on our results, we recommend the use of gS_{LAD} over gS_{OLS} (and other existing tests) uniformly for all study analyses.

In the presence of group membership uncertainty, gS incorporating the probabilistic data increases power compared to using the "best-guess" group data. However, based on the simulations considered here, we note that when the group uncertainty level is moderate (e.g. 30%), the efficiency gain is also moderate (Table 4 and Figure 1). When the group uncertainty is too high, the relative efficiency gain may diminish because the absolute power decreases considerably and eventually converges to the the type 1 error rate.

In the presence of sample correlation, the original *Lev* test is inadequate due to inflated type 1 error. Using a subset of only unrelated individuals would improve the accuracy of *Lev* but at a cost to the power. The size of the efficiency loss depends on the proportion omitted from the sample as well as the dependency structure. The *TW* method of Iachine et al. (2010) extends the *Lev* test for twin data. Their simulation study as well as ours showed

that TW has an increased type 1 error rate when group sizes are unbalanced and relatively small, in contrast to the proposed gS. When all group sizes were large, gS and TW were empirically equivalent.

In the CF application, although the gS test yielded comparable or less significant results after reincorporating siblings in the analysis, we observed that the corresponding gL test results were more significant. We considered the possibility that even though scale differences existed in the data, the addition of only 98 siblings (7% increase from the independent sample) may not yield a noticeable improvement in power of the gS test. Using the setup of simulation model 1, we examined the effect of incorporating only a small proportion of additional related subjects to an otherwise independent sample (Web Table 4). We found that, compared with using a sample of 1000 singletons, using a sample of $n = 900$ singletons along with 100 sib-pairs (10% increase) led to a $< 5\%$ power increase. In contrast, the addition of siblings to all unrelated subjects provided a substantial increase in power (Web Table 4). These results, and the noticeable power gain from the gL location test when applied to the same CF data, are consistent with previous observations in genetic association studies that, larger samples are needed to detect variance differences as compared to mean differences (Visscher and Posthuma, 2010; Yang et al., 2011).

The examination of the proposed gS here focused on SNP genotype categories. The so-called "additive" coding of the genotype data can be used in practice. That is, replacing the two dummy variables, x_1 and x_2, with one continuous variable coded as $x = 0, 1$ or 2, if there is no group uncertainty; or replacing the two probabilistic variables, x_1 and x_2, with an expected count (the so-called "dosage"), $x = p_1 + 2 * p_2$. If the underlying model is truly additive, this model specification will lead to a more powerful test. However, the additivity assumption is often used only for testing the location parameters in genetic association studies.

The expression of $E(d_i) = \sigma_i\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}(1-h_{ii})}$ in Section 2.2 suggests that the stage 2 regression of (4) could be improved by rescaling the d_i's by $(1-h_{ii})^{-1/2}$. This adjustment has been shown to improve the type 1 error control of Levene's original test for small samples with group design imbalance (Keyes and Levy, 1997) (independent observations with no group uncertainty implies $h_{ii} = 1/n_j$, where n_j is the sample size of the group to which the ith observation belongs). Examination of this rescaling for gS under simulations involving correlated data, however, led to instances of increased type 1 error (results not shown). Thus, further investigation is required to propose an appropriate adjustment. Another potential improvement to the analysis of regression model (4) is from the recognition that the d_i's are folded normals and are in fact slightly correlated through correlation between the estimated residuals, $\widehat{\varepsilon}_i$'s, even when there is no sample correlation among the true disturbances, ε_i's. O'Neill and Mathews (2000) derived expressions for the covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{d}$ for independent observations with no group uncertainty, showing that the correlation across the d_i's disappears as the group sizes increase. For the complex data scenarios considered here, gS_{LAD} appears robust for even small samples. Nevertheless, the potential for gain in efficiency by accounting for this type of correlation merits additional consideration.

The developments here did not consider additional covariates, $\boldsymbol{z}$, e.g. age and sex in genetic association studies. The extension is straightforward if the effects of $\boldsymbol{z}$ on y are strictly on the mean. In that case, including $\boldsymbol{z}$ as part of the design matrix in the stage 1 regression of (2) suffices. However, if $\boldsymbol{z}$ also influences the variance of y, not including $\boldsymbol{z}$ as part of the design matrix in the stage 2 regression of (4) may lead to increased type 1 error of testing the γ_j's that are associated with the primary covariates of interest. This is the same phenomenon observed in location-testing where omitting potential confounders can lead to spurious association.

Joint location-scale testing is becoming a popular method for complex outcome-covariate

association data, where the conventional location-only analyses may be underpowered. This scenario has received attention in many fields ranging from economics to climate dynamics Marozzi (2013), in addition to our motivating example of genetic epidemiology (Soave et al., 2015). The proposed gS test allows investigators to combine evidence from scale tests with existing generalized location tests via the JLS testing framework of (Soave et al., 2015), previously proposed for independent samples without group membership uncertainty. The CF application study showed that individual location or scale tests can provide more significant results when utilizing related individuals, which in turn may lead to a more powerful $gJLS$ test.

6. Supplementary Materials

Web Appendix Sections A, B and C, Web Figure 1, Web Tables 1-4, and R-code description for data analysis referenced in Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 are available below in this document.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Professor Jerry F. Lawless and Dr. Lisa J. Strug for helpful suggestions and critical reading of the original version of the paper. The authors thank Dr. Andrew Paterson and Dr. Lisa J. Strug for providing the type 1 diabetes and the cystic fibrosis application data, respectively. This research is funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC 250053-2013 to LS) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR 201309MOP-117978 to LS). DS is a trainee of the CIHR STAGE (Strategic Training in Advanced Genetic Epidemiology) training program at the University of Toronto and is a recipient of the SickKids Restracomp Studentship Award and the Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS).

References

Abney, M. (2015). Permutation testing in the presence of polygenic variation. *Genet Epidemiol* **39,** 249–58.

Acar, E. F. and Sun, L. (2013). A generalized Kruskal-Wallis test incorporating group uncertainty with application to genetic association studies. *Biometrics* **69,** 427–35.

Aitken, A. C. (1936). On least squares and linear combination of observations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* **55,** 42–48.

Arnold, S. F. (1980). Asymptotic validity of F tests for the ordinary linear model and the multiple correlation model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **75,** 890–894.

Baltagi, B. H. (2008). *Econometrics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, fourth edition.

Bartlett, M. S. (1937). Properties of sufficiency and statistical tests. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **160,** 268–282.

Breusch, T. S. and Pagan, A. R. (1979). A simple test for heteroscedasticity and random coefficient variation. *Econometrica* **47,** 1287–1294.

Brown, M. B. and Forsythe, A. B. (1974). Robust tests for the equality of variances. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **69,** 364–367.

Cameron, A. C. and Miller, D. L. (2013). A practitioners guide to cluster-robust inference. *Forthcoming in Journal of Human Resources* pages 221–236.

Cao, Y., Wei, P., Bailey, M., Kauwe, J. S., Maxwell, T. J., and the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (2014). A versatile omnibus test for detecting mean and variance heterogeneity. *Genet Epidemiol* **38,** 51–9.

Carroll, R. J. and Schneider, H. (1985). A note on Levene's tests for equality of variances. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **3,** 191–194.

Conover, W. J., Johnson, M. E., and Johnson, M. M. (1981). A comparative study of tests for homogeneity of variances, with applications to the outer continental shelf bidding

data. *Technometrics* **23,** 351–361.

Cook, R. D. and Weisberg, S. (1983). Diagnostics for heteroscedasticity in regression. *Biometrika* **70,** 1–10.

Derkach, A., Lawless, J. F., and Sun, L. (2013). Robust and powerful tests for rare variants using Fisher's method to combine evidence of association from two or more complementary tests. *Genet Epidemiol* **37,** 110–21.

Derkach, A., Lawless, J. F., and Sun, L. (2014). Pooled association tests for rare genetic variants: A review and some new results. *Statistical Science* **29,** 302–321.

Furno, M. (2005). The Glejser test and the median regression. *Sankhy: The Indian Journal of Statistics* pages 335–358.

Gastwirth, J. L., Gel, Y. R., and Miao, W. (2009). The impact of Levene's test of equality of variances on statistical theory and practice. *Statistical Science* pages 343–360.

Glejser, H. (1969). A new test for heteroskedasticity. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **64,** 316–323.

Godfrey, L. G. (1996). Some results on the Glejser and Koenker tests for heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* **72,** 275–299.

Haseman, J. K. and Elston, R. C. (1970). The estimation of genetic variance from twin data. *Behav Genet* **1,** 11–9.

Horvath, S., Xu, X., and Laird, N. M. (2001). The family based association test method: strategies for studying general genotype–phenotype associations. *Eur J Hum Genet* **9,** 301–6.

Iachine, I., Petersen, H. C., and Kyvik, K. O. (2010). Robust tests for the equality of variances for clustered data. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **80,** 365–377.

Im, K. S. (2000). Robustifying Glejser test of heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* **97,** 179–188.

Jakobsdottir, J. and McPeek, M. S. (2013). MASTOR: mixed-model association mapping of quantitative traits in samples with related individuals. *Am J Hum Genet* **92,** 652–66.

Keyes, T. K. and Levy, M. S. (1997). Analysis of Levenes test under design imbalance. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* **22,** 227–236.

Kutalik, Z., Johnson, T., Bochud, M., Mooser, V., Vollenweider, P., Waeber, G., and et al. (2011). Methods for testing association between uncertain genotypes and quantitative traits. *Biostatistics* **12,** 1–17.

Levene, H. (1960). Robust tests for equality of variances. In Olkin, I., editor, *Contributions to probability and statistics; essays in honor of Harold Hotelling*, pages 278–292. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.

Li, W., Soave, D., Miller, M. R., Keenan, K., Lin, F., Gong, J., and et al. (2014). Unraveling the complex genetic model for cystic fibrosis: pleiotropic effects of modifier genes on early cystic fibrosis-related morbidities. *Hum Genet* **133,** 151–61.

Lim, T.-S. and Loh, W.-Y. (1996). A comparison of tests of equality of variances. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **22,** 287–301.

Machado, J. A. F. and Silva, J. M. C. S. (2000). Glejser's test revisited. *Journal of Econometrics* **97,** 189–202.

Marozzi, M. (2013). Nonparametric simultaneous tests for location and scale testing: A comparison of several methods. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* **42,** 1298–1317.

O'Neill, M. E. and Mathews, K. (2000). Theory & methods: A weighted least squares approach to Levene's test of homogeneity of variance. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics* **42,** 81–100.

Owen, A. B. (2009). Karl Pearson's meta-analysis revisited. *Ann Statist* pages 3867–3892.

Pare, G., Cook, N. R., Ridker, P. M., and Chasman, D. I. (2010). On the use of variance

per genotype as a tool to identify quantitative trait interaction effects: a report from the women's genome health study. *PLoS Genet* **6,** e1000981.

Paterson, A. D., Waggott, D., Boright, A. P., Hosseini, S. M., Shen, E., Sylvestre, M. P., and et al. (2010). A genome-wide association study identifies a novel major locus for glycemic control in type 1 diabetes, as measured by both A1C and glucose. *Diabetes* **59,** 539–49.

Pinheiro, J. C. and Bates, D. M. (2000). *Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS*. Statistics and computing. Springer, New York.

Soave, D., Corvol, H., Panjwani, N., Gong, J., Li, W., Boelle, P. Y., and et al. (2015). A joint location-scale test improves power to detect associated SNPs, gene sets, and pathways. *Am J Hum Genet* **97,** 125–38.

Sun, L. (2012). Detecting pedigree relationship errors. In Elston, C. R., Satagopan, M. J., and Sun, S., editors, *Statistical Human Genetics: Methods and Protocols*, pages 25–46. Humana Press, Totowa, NJ.

Sun, L. and Dimitromanolakis, A. (2012). Identifying cryptic relationships. In Elston, C. R., Satagopan, M. J., and Sun, S., editors, *Statistical Human Genetics: Methods and Protocols*, pages 47–57. Humana Press, Totowa, NJ.

Sun, L., Rommens, J. M., Corvol, H., Li, W., Li, X., Chiang, T. A., and et al. (2012). Multiple apical plasma membrane constituents are associated with susceptibility to meconium ileus in individuals with cystic fibrosis. *Nat Genet* **44,** 562–9.

Sun, X., Elston, R., Morris, N., and Zhu, X. (2013). What is the significance of difference in phenotypic variability across snp genotypes? *Am J Hum Genet* **93,** 390–7.

Taylor, C., Commander, C. W., Collaco, J. M., Strug, L. J., Li, W., Wright, F. A., and et al. (2011). A novel lung disease phenotype adjusted for mortality attrition for cystic fibrosis genetic modifier studies. *Pediatr Pulmonol* **46,** 857–69.

Thompson, E. A. (1975). The estimation of pairwise relationships. *Ann Hum Genet* **39,** 173–88.

Visscher, P. M. and Posthuma, D. (2010). Statistical power to detect genetic loci affecting environmental sensitivity. *Behav Genet* **40,** 728–33.

White, H. (1980). A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica* **48,** 817–838.

Yang, Y., Christensen, O. F., and Sorensen, D. (2011). Use of genomic models to study genetic control of environmental variance. *Genet Res (Camb)* **93,** 125–38.



Figure 1. **Relative efficiency of gS^{BG}_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} under simulation model 2.** gS^{BG}_{LAD} denotes gS_{LAD} applied to the "best-guess" genotype data, and the relative efficiency is the power of gS_{LAD} divided by the power of gS^{BG}_{LAD}. The true genotypes were masked using a Dirichlet distribution with scale parameters a for the correct genotype and $(1-a)/2$ for the other two. On average, $a = 0.5$ corresponds to 50% group uncertainty, and $a = 1$ corresponds to no genotype uncertainty (i.e. 0%). Parameter values included $n/2 = 500$ sib pairs, and $\rho = 0.5$ within-pair correlation. The MAF and $(\sigma_0^2, \sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2)$ were 0.1 and (1, 1.5, 2) for (**a**), 0.1 and (2, 1.5, 1) for (**b**), 0.2 and (1, 1.5, 2) for (**c**), and 0.2, (2, 1.5, 1) for (**d**). Power was estimated from 1,000 simulated replicates at the 5% level. The absolute power of gS^{BG}_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} at the 30% group uncertainty level for (**a**) and (**c**) are presented in Table 4 under Gaussian data.

Table 1

Type 1 error evaluation under simulation model 1. *Six different tests were evaluated, including the original Levene's test, Lev, the twin test of Iachine et al. (2010), TW, and the proposed generalized scale test, gS, with subscripts $_{OLS}$ and $_{LAD}$ denoting whether the stage 1 regression was performed using OLS or LAD. Parameter values included n_1 and n_2 for the number of MZ and DZ twin pairs, respectively, and $\rho_1 = 0.75$ and $\rho_2 = 0.5$ for the corresponding within-pair correlations. Without loss of generality, $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = 1$ for type 1 error rate evaluation. The empirical type 1 error was estimated from 10,000 simulated replicates at the nominal 5% level.*

n_1	n_2	Lev_{OLS}	Lev_{LAD}	TW_{OLS}	TW_{LAD}	gS_{OLS}	gS_{LAD}
				Gaussian			
20	20	0.102	0.087	0.055	0.044	0.058	0.046
5	5	0.115	0.071	0.085	0.041	0.099	0.049
10	20	0.112	0.091	0.085	0.064	0.075	0.054
5	10	0.114	0.079	0.118	0.079	0.092	0.054
				Student's t_4			
20	20	0.102	0.084	0.056	0.043	0.059	0.045
5	5	0.129	0.069	0.086	0.037	0.103	0.046
10	20	0.118	0.093	0.090	0.069	0.078	0.054
5	10	0.123	0.076	0.115	0.071	0.093	0.048
				χ^2_4			
20	20	0.175	0.098	0.112	0.052	0.117	0.054
5	5	0.180	0.083	0.133	0.053	0.153	0.061
10	20	0.181	0.102	0.146	0.079	0.137	0.062
5	10	0.187	0.094	0.178	0.085	0.149	0.064

Table 2

Type 1 error evaluation under simulation model 2 without group uncertainty. *Parameter values included* $n/2$ *for the number of sib-pairs,* $\rho = 0.5$ *for the within-pair correlations, and* q *= 0.1 or 0.2 for the minor allele frequency (MAF) of the SNP of interest; on average the expected sizes of the three genotype groups are* $n(1-q)^2$, $n2q(1-q)$ *and* nq^2. *Without loss of generality,* $\sigma_0^2 = \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = 1$ *for type 1 error rate evaluation. The empirical type 1 error was estimated from 10,000 simulated replicates at the nominal 5% level.*

$n/2$	Gaussian		Student's t_4		χ^2_4	
	TW_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}
			MAF=0.1			
20	0.110	0.040	0.109	0.042	0.113	0.044
50	0.117	0.043	0.140	0.046	0.160	0.044
100	0.092	0.048	0.115	0.049	0.118	0.047
500	0.056	0.048	0.068	0.047	0.070	0.052
1000	0.055	0.050	0.061	0.049	0.058	0.045
			MAF=0.2			
20	0.068	0.039	0.072	0.040	0.092	0.050
50	0.074	0.042	0.086	0.041	0.095	0.046
100	0.060	0.048	0.072	0.044	0.078	0.051
500	0.055	0.051	0.055	0.047	0.057	0.052
1000	0.051	0.051	0.053	0.051	0.056	0.051

Table 3

Type 1 error evaluation under simulation model 2 with 30% group uncertainty. *Superscript ^{BG} denotes TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} applied to the "best-guess" genotype data. The true genotype data were masked using a Dirichlet distribution for the genotype probabilities with scale parameters a for the correct genotype and $(1-a)/2$ for the other two. On average, $a = 0.7$ corresponds to 30% group uncertainty level. See legend of Table 2 for additional simulation details.*

$n/2$	Gaussian				Student's t_4				χ^2_4			
	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}
						MAF=0.1						
20	0.067	0.074	0.036	0.037	0.083	0.079	0.044	0.046	0.088	0.090	0.047	0.050
50	0.066	0.062	0.045	0.045	0.076	0.062	0.046	0.046	0.084	0.076	0.049	0.053
100	0.058	0.057	0.045	0.046	0.064	0.059	0.047	0.046	0.072	0.069	0.051	0.049
500	0.057	0.054	0.054	0.052	0.056	0.053	0.052	0.048	0.055	0.052	0.050	0.048
1000	0.051	0.055	0.052	0.054	0.053	0.050	0.052	0.049	0.054	0.052	0.049	0.047
						MAF=0.2						
20	0.061	0.062	0.040	0.039	0.065	0.063	0.037	0.044	0.075	0.073	0.047	0.050
50	0.053	0.053	0.046	0.045	0.063	0.059	0.046	0.050	0.069	0.070	0.051	0.053
100	0.049	0.051	0.046	0.045	0.057	0.053	0.047	0.049	0.059	0.058	0.049	0.047
500	0.051	0.049	0.049	0.051	0.051	0.052	0.048	0.050	0.053	0.052	0.048	0.051
1000	0.049	0.046	0.047	0.047	0.052	0.049	0.047	0.049	0.055	0.053	0.050	0.052

Table 4

Power of gS_{LAD}^{BG} ***and*** gS_{LAD} ***under simulation model 2 with 30% group uncertainty.*** *gS_{LAD}^{BG} denotes gS_{LAD} applied to the "best-guess" genotype data. The true genotypes were masked using a Dirichlet distribution for the genotype probabilities with scale parameters a for the correct genotype and $(1-a)/2$ for the other two. On average, $a = 0.7$ corresponds to 30% group uncertainty. Besides the parameters shown in the table, other values include $\rho = 0.5$ for within-pair correlation, and $(\sigma_0^2, \sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2) = (1, 1.5, 2)$. Power was estimated from 1,000 simulated replicates at the 5% level.*

$n/2$	Gaussian		Student's t_4		χ_4^2	
	gS_{LAD}^{BG}	gS_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}^{BG}	gS_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}^{BG}	gS_{LAD}
			MAF=0.1			
20	0.064	0.066	0.067	0.077	0.050	0.064
50	0.079	0.087	0.077	0.081	0.089	0.089
100	0.124	0.152	0.087	0.112	0.101	0.117
500	0.495	0.613	0.314	0.420	0.376	0.442
1000	0.795	0.885	0.533	0.671	0.634	0.759
			MAF=0.2			
20	0.050	0.066	0.062	0.058	0.063	0.074
50	0.089	0.120	0.084	0.089	0.091	0.104
100	0.166	0.196	0.114	0.129	0.129	0.160
500	0.668	0.784	0.471	0.582	0.499	0.608
1000	0.939	0.985	0.739	0.846	0.810	0.896

Table 5

Application study of lung function in patients with cystic fibrosis. *There were 1313 singletons, 94 sib-pairs and 2 sib-trios in the whole sample, resulting in* $n_{indep} = 1313 + 94 + 2 = 1409$ *unrelated individuals, and* $n_{all} = 1313 + 94 * 2 + 2 * 3 = 1507$ *individuals. Results for* n_{indep} *were from Soave et al. (2015), where the standard regression Location test, Levene's scale test and the JLS joint location-scale test were used. Results for* n_{all} *were obtained from the corresponding generalized tests, with LAD used for the stage-1 regression for the gS test.*

					$n_{indep} = 1409$			$n_{all} = 1507$		
Chr	Gene	SNP	bp-Position	MAF	*L*ocation	*S*cale	*JLS*	*gL*	*gS*	*gJLS*
1	*SLC26A9*	rs7512462	204,166,218	0.41	0.30	0.58	0.48	0.30	0.39	0.36
1	*SLC26A9*	rs4077468	204,181,380	0.42	0.53	0.61	0.69	0.45	0.59	0.62
1	*SLC26A9*	rs12047830	204,183,322	0.49	0.55	0.15	0.29	0.52	0.11	0.22
1	*SLC26A9*	rs7419153	204,183,932	0.37	0.50	0.06	0.14	0.73	0.09	0.24
5	*SLC9A3*	rs17563161	550,624	0.26	0.0004	0.02	0.0001	0.0002	0.02	$5.6\text{x}10^{-5}$
X	*SLC6A14*	rs12839137	115,479,578	0.24	0.02	0.08	0.01	0.01	0.16	0.02
X	*SLC6A14*	rs5905283	115,479,909	0.49	0.009	0.07	0.005	0.005	0.18	0.007
X	*SLC6A14*	rs3788766	115,480,867	0.40	0.001	0.01	0.0002	0.0004	0.02	9.5x10−5

Web-based Supplementary Materials for "A Generalized Levene's Scale Test for Variance Heterogeneity in the Presence of Sample Correlation and Group Uncertainty"

by David Soave and Lei Sun

Web Appendix A: Asymptotic Distribution of gS

A number of authors have investigated the asymptotic distribution of test statistics based on absolute residuals from independent observations with respect to estimation effects; effects on stage 2 regression analysis when using absolute residuals, $d_i = |\widehat{\varepsilon_i}| = \left|y_i - \boldsymbol{x_i}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right|$, from stage 1 instead of absolute true disturbances $|\varepsilon_i| = \left|y_i - \boldsymbol{x_i}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right|$ (Godfrey, 1996; Im, 2000; Machado and Silva, 2000; Furno, 2005; Carroll and Schneider, 1985). In general, stage 2 tests involving d_i from stage 1 OLS regression are only asymptotically correct when the y_i follow a symmetric distribution. Conversely, stage 2 tests involving d_i from stage 1 LAD regression will be asymptotically correct regardless of the shape of the error distribution (Furno, 2005; Carroll and Schneider, 1985). We demonstrate here that these results hold for the proposed gS test when using the F-statistic in the stage 2 generalized least squares regression to account for possible data dependence due to clusters/family relationships.

In keeping with the notation from the main text, we use only a single subscript (e.g. $i = 1, \ldots, n$) to represent individuals across the sample and rely on the covariance matrix, $\Sigma_{stage\,2} = \sigma_d^2\Sigma_d$, to specify relationships between family/cluster members. Note that we are assuming homoscedasticity across the d_i's and thus $\Sigma_d = CC^T$ describes the Cholesky decomposition of the correlation across $\boldsymbol{d}$. Let $f_i = \left|y_i - \boldsymbol{x_i}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right|$, represent the absolute true disturbances from the stage 1 model (2), where $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ represents the true central tendency parameter vector being estimated (i.e. mean or median). For fixed C, let $\boldsymbol{f}^* = C^{-1}\boldsymbol{f}$, such that for the model $\boldsymbol{f}^* = \alpha\mathbf{1}^* + Z^*\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{e}^*$, $E(\boldsymbol{e}^*) = \mathbf{0}$ and $Var(\boldsymbol{e}^*) = \sigma_f^2 I$. Note that $\mathbf{1}^* = C^{-1}\mathbf{1}$

and $Z^* = C^{-1}Z$ are a partitioned transformation of the gS stage 1 regression design matrix (i.e. $X = (\mathbf{1}, Z)$ from equation (3)). Also note that the f subscript of σ_f^2 defines the variance parameter associated with $\boldsymbol{f}$ conditional on C and X. We assume that we are able estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and that $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$ has an asymptotic multivariate normal distribution with finite covariance matrix; this would be true for either OLS or LAD stage 1 regression estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

We consider an F-test based on d_i^*, which are the elements of $\boldsymbol{d}^* = \boldsymbol{C}^{-1}\boldsymbol{d}$,

$$F(\boldsymbol{d}^*) = \frac{MSR(\boldsymbol{d}^*)}{MSE(\boldsymbol{d}^*)} = \frac{\sum_i^n (\widehat{d_i^*} - \widetilde{d_i^*})^2/(k-1)}{\sum_i^n (d_i^* - \widehat{d_i^*})^2/(n-k)},$$

where $\widehat{d_i^*} = (\boldsymbol{x}_i^*)^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, the predicted values from the regression equation (7), and $\widetilde{d_i^*} = 1_i^*\widetilde{\alpha}$, the predicted values from the regression of $\boldsymbol{d}^*$ on $\mathbf{1}^*$.

We first note that, in the absence of estimation effects, $(k-1)F(\boldsymbol{f}^*)$ is asymptotically distributed as chi-squared with $k-1$ degrees of freedom (see Arnold (1980)). To obtain the asymptotic distribution of $F(\boldsymbol{d}^*)$ we need to assume that $(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \varepsilon_i)$ satisfy regularity conditions necessary for the application of standard asymptotic theory. Specifically, we assume

ASSUMPTION 1: $E(\boldsymbol{x}_i\varepsilon_i) = \mathbf{0}$

ASSUMPTION 2: $E(\boldsymbol{x}_i\boldsymbol{x}_i^T)$ is positive definite

ASSUMPTION 3: $(y_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i^T)$ has finite fourth moment.

Similar to the assertion of Carroll and Schneider (1985), we have that $MSE(\boldsymbol{d}^*) \xrightarrow{p} \sigma^2 = Var(f_i^*)$.

We can also rewrite the numerator of $F_n(\boldsymbol{d}^*)$ as

$$MSR(\boldsymbol{d}^*) = \frac{1}{k-1}\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^*(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}_i^*})^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}_i^*})(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}_i^*})^T\right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}_i^*})d_i^*.$$

where $(\boldsymbol{z}_i^*)^T$ are the row vectors of Z^*, and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}_i^*}$ are the predicted values from regressing the column(s) of Z^* on $\mathbf{1}^*$. Note that $\mathbf{1}^*$ will not, in general, be a vector or 1's, and will only be

constant when all observations come from equal sized clusters with an identical symmetric correlation structure.

Let $t = 1, ..., T$ and $s = 1, ..., S$ index the variables associated with the residuals, $\widehat{\varepsilon}_i$, that take positive and negative values, respectively. Correspondingly, T and S are the number of residuals that take positive and negative values, respectively. Let $c_{i,j}$ represent the element for the ith row and jth column of the matrix C^{-1}, and let $[-]_i$ denote the ith element from the vector with the square brackets.

Finally, we make the additional assumption,

ASSUMPTION 4: $E(\boldsymbol{x}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i^T | \varepsilon_i > 0) = E(\boldsymbol{x}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i^T | \varepsilon_i < 0)$.

This assumption follows from Assumption 1, that $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ and ε_i are uncorrelated, and implies

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)c_{i,t}\boldsymbol{x}_t^T =& \frac{1}{S}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s=1}^{S}(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)c_{i,s}\boldsymbol{x}_s^T + o_p(1) \\ =& \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)c_{i,j}\boldsymbol{x}_j^T + o_p(1).\end{aligned}$$

Now, applying the results of Lemma 1 from Im (2000), we propose the following lemma with proof similar to Im (2000) Lemma 3,

Lemma 1. Under Assumptions 1-4,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)d_i^* - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)f_i^* \\ &= -\left(2Pr(\varepsilon_l > 0) - 1\right)\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)c_{i,j}\boldsymbol{x}_j^T\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1).\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&LHS \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)(d_i^* - f_i^*) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*) \left(\left[C^{-1} \boldsymbol{d} \right]_i - \left[C^{-1} \boldsymbol{f} \right]_i \right) + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*) \left(- \sum_{t=1}^{T} c_{i,t} \boldsymbol{x}_t^T (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_{i,s} \boldsymbol{x}_s^T (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right) + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*) \left(-\frac{T}{n} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} c_{i,t} \boldsymbol{x}_t^T + \frac{S}{n} \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_{i,s} \boldsymbol{x}_s^T \right) (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*) \left(-\frac{T}{n} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} c_{i,t} \boldsymbol{x}_t^T + \frac{S}{n} \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_{i,s} \boldsymbol{x}_s^T \right) \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1) \\
&= \left(-\frac{T}{n} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*) c_{i,t} \boldsymbol{x}_t^T + \frac{S}{n} \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{S} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*)^T c_{i,s} \boldsymbol{x}_s^T \right) \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1) \\
&= -\frac{(T-S)}{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^* - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{z}}_i^*) c_{i,j} \boldsymbol{x}_j^T \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1) \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned}
$$

If the final equation becomes negligible as n becomes large, we can say that the absolute residuals, $\boldsymbol{d}$, may replace the true disturbances, $\boldsymbol{f}$, where

$$MSR(\boldsymbol{d}^*) - MSR(\boldsymbol{f}^*) \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

and consequently

$$F(\boldsymbol{d}^*) - F(\boldsymbol{f}^*) \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

This, in general, will only be the case when $(T-S)/n = o_p(1)$, which will occur for stage 1 OLS regression only if the error distribution is symmetric. On the other hand, $(T-S)/n = o_p(1)$ is ensured for stage 1 LAD regression as minimization of the sum of absolute residuals must equate the number of positive and negative residuals (Koenker and Hallock, 2001). Note that Lemma 1 and its proof reduce to the same result of Im (2000) Lemma 3 for the case where $\Sigma_d = I$ (independent errors).

This leads to the following result.

Theorem 1. Under the previously stated conditions, if $(T-S)/n = o_p(1)$,

$$(k-1)F(\boldsymbol{d}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2(k-1).$$

Web Appendix B: Independence between the generalized location (gL) and scale (gS) test statistics

To test for a location (mean) effect of a set of $(k-1)$ covariates, $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T = (1, x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{i(k-1)})$ including an intercept, on a quantitative outcome y_i with known correlation among the y_i's, we can obtain the F-statistic from a generalized least squares regression of the linear model,

$$\boldsymbol{y} = X\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{stage1}), \tag{1-1}$$

where the design matrix, X, represents the stacking of the $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T$'s, and Σ_{stage1} represents the covariance matrix for $\boldsymbol{y}$. We include indexes for families $(i = 1, \ldots, M)$ and members within families $(j = 1, \ldots, n_i)$ to specify models that allows for within group/family dependence of observations as would be encountered in sibling or pedigree data. Under the assumption of homoscedasticity, Σ_{stage1} can be written as $\sigma_y^2\Sigma_y$, where the correlation matrix, Σ_y, specifies relationships between family/cluster members.

Let $\Sigma_y = C_y C_y^T$ be the Cholesky decomposition, and for fixed Σ_y, we use the following transformations,

$$\boldsymbol{y}^* = C^{-1}\boldsymbol{y}, \;\; X^* = C^{-1}X, \;\; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^* = C^{-1}\boldsymbol{\epsilon},$$

Thus, we can rewrite (1-1) as a classical linear model,

$$\boldsymbol{y^*} = X^*\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon^*}, \;\; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon^*} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_y^2 I).$$

Thus, the generalized location (gL) test statistic ($T_{Location}$) is simply the F-statistic from an ordinary least squares regression of $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ on X^*, which can be written as

$$T_{Location} = F(\boldsymbol{y}^*) = \frac{MSR(\boldsymbol{y}^*)}{MSE(\boldsymbol{y}^*)} = \frac{\sum_i^n (\widehat{y_i^*} - \widetilde{y_i^*})^2/(k-1)}{\sum_i^n (y_i^* - \widehat{y_i^*})^2/(n-k)},$$

where $\widetilde{y_i^*} = 1_i^* \widetilde{\beta}_0$ and $\widehat{y_i^*} = \boldsymbol{x}_i^{*T} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{all}$, are the predicted values from the regressions of $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ on the first column of X^*(yielding $\widetilde{\beta}_0$) and all columns of X^*(yielding $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{all}$), respectively.

Without loss of generality, we assume the analysis of genetic data involving related subjects (family data) with an additive genetic model where y_i is the quantitative trait under investigation and $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T = (1, x_i)$, where $x_i = 0, 1$ or 2, reflects the number of minor alleles at a genetic variant under analysis, or the genotype dosage estimate incorporating uncertainty. Thus, the density of $\boldsymbol{y}$ is an exponential family with three parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = (\frac{\beta_1}{\sigma^2}, -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}, \frac{\beta_0}{\sigma^2})$, for which the sufficient statistics $\boldsymbol{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3) = (\sum x_i^* y_i^*, \sum y_i^{*2}, \sum 1_i^* y_i^*)$ are complete. Note that 1_i^* and x_i^* are obtained from X^*, and y_i^* from $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ defined above.

Let T_{Scale} be the proposed gS test statistic (see Section 2.3, equation (8)) analyzing the same covariate vector specified for $T_{Location}$. Now we have the following Lemma.

Lemma 2: For the conditional normal model $\boldsymbol{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(X\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_y^2 \Sigma_y)$ with fixed Σ_y, $T_{Location}$ and T_{Scale} are independent.

Proof. We showed that if $\Sigma_{stage2} = \sigma_d^2 \Sigma_d$, with Σ_d fixed, and the covariate design vector $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T$ is length k, including intercept, then T_{Scale} is asymptotically distributed as chi-squared with $k-1$ degrees of freedom (Theorem 1, Web Appendix A), and it does not depend on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (i.e. T_{Scale} is ancillary for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$). Thus, T_{Scale} is independent of $\boldsymbol{T}$ (see page 152 in Lehmann and Romano (2005)). Because $T_{Location}$ is a function of $\boldsymbol{T}$, $T_{Location}$ and T_{Scale} are therefore independent. ■

Web Appendix C: Implementing gS, TW, and Lev tests

Under the simulation model 1 setup, we compared the performance of three tests: Levene's original test procedure (using two measures of central tendency: the sample means and sample medians, implemented in R using the "lawstat" package), the TW test proposed

by Iachine et al. (2010) (using the same two measures of central tendency, with stage 2 regression implemented in R (see below) to mimic the results of the *regress*, *cluster*() command implemented in STATA), and our proposed gS test (using the same two measures of central tendency, with stage 2 regression implemented in R using the $gls()$ function in the "nlme" package).

For the different parameter combinations of simulation model 2, we considered two measures of central tendency from stage 1 of the procedure: the predicted values from OLS and LAD regression. All testing procedures were implemented in R as just described, while using the $rq()$ function from the "quantreg" package to perform stage 1 LAD regression. [R Core Team (2016). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.]

TW: Implementing the cluster-robust stage 2 regression in R

Numerous modifications have been proposed for various types of cluster-designed data sets (Cameron and Miller, 2013). Iachine et al. (2010) chose to implement TW with the STATA statistical software command *regress* using the *cluster*() option to incorporate the cluster information in a standard error adjustment. This method of cluster robust inference can be implemented with the R software as follows: First, fit the desired panel data model (e.g. $\boldsymbol{d} \sim X$ for the stage 2 regression; equation (4) of Section 2.2) using the $plm()$ function from the "plm" package, with option *index*="cluster.id". Next, estimate the cluster robust covariance matrix using the $vcovHC()$ function from the "sandwich" package, with options type= "$HC0$" and $adjust = T$. Next, multiply the covariance matrix by the following adjustment factor:

$$\frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{n-1}{n-k},$$

where M is the total number of clusters and $n-k$ is the residual degrees of freedom from the plm model. Next, perform the coefficient test using the $waldtest()$ function from the

"lmtest" package, setting the *vcov* option equal to the new covariance matrix and the *test* option equal to "*F*". Finally, the resulting F-statistic is then compared to an F-distribution with (k-1) and (M-1) degrees of freedom to obtain the p-value of the TW test. (Note that the default degrees of freedom for *waldtest*() will be (k-1) and (N-1).)

Web Tables and Figure

Table 1

Type 1 error evaluation under simulation model 1 (large samples). *Six different tests were evaluated, including the original Levene's test, Lev, the twin test of Iachine et al. (2010), TW, and the proposed generalized scale test, gS, with subscripts* $_{OLS}$ *and* $_{LAD}$ *denoting whether the stage 1 regression was performed using OLS or LAD. Parameter values include* n_1 *and* n_2 *for the number of MZ and DZ twin pairs, respectively, and* $\rho_1 = 0.75$ *and* $\rho_2 = 0.5$ *for the corresponding within-pair correlations. Without loss of generality,* $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = 1$ *for type 1 error rate evaluation. The empirical type 1 error was estimated from 10,000 simulated replicates at the nominal 5% level.*

n_1	n_2	Lev_{OLS}	Lev_{LAD}	TW_{OLS}	TW_{LAD}	gS_{OLS}	gS_{LAD}
				Gaussian			
2000	2000	0.097	0.097	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050
500	500	0.094	0.093	0.049	0.048	0.049	0.048
1000	2000	0.102	0.102	0.050	0.050	0.058	0.058
500	1000	0.103	0.102	0.053	0.052	0.062	0.061
				Student's t_4			
2000	2000	0.091	0.091	0.045	0.045	0.045	0.045
500	500	0.094	0.093	0.048	0.047	0.048	0.047
1000	2000	0.097	0.098	0.046	0.046	0.055	0.055
500	1000	0.107	0.105	0.050	0.050	0.059	0.058
				χ_4^2			
2000	2000	0.164	0.102	0.103	0.052	0.103	0.052
500	500	0.161	0.100	0.103	0.047	0.103	0.047
1000	2000	0.179	0.111	0.109	0.052	0.123	0.060
500	1000	0.173	0.107	0.104	0.052	0.116	0.060

Table 2

Type 1 error evaluation under simulation model 2 with 10% group uncertainty. *Superscript ^{BG} denotes TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} being applied to the "best-guess" genotype data. The true genotype data were masked using a Dirichlet distribution for the genotype probabilities with scale parameters a for the correct genotype and $(1-a)/2$ for the other two. On average $a = 0.9$ corresponds to 10% group uncertainty. See legend of Table 2 (main text) for additional simulation details.*

$n/2$	Gaussian				Student's t_4				χ^2_4			
	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}
					MAF=0.1							
20	0.089	0.165	0.041	0.034	0.097	0.165	0.044	0.039	0.106	0.182	0.053	0.049
50	0.097	0.088	0.043	0.041	0.114	0.108	0.046	0.044	0.126	0.122	0.046	0.047
100	0.071	0.071	0.045	0.047	0.088	0.084	0.046	0.046	0.102	0.099	0.050	0.047
500	0.056	0.056	0.050	0.052	0.061	0.060	0.046	0.046	0.063	0.063	0.052	0.050
1000	0.051	0.052	0.046	0.049	0.054	0.053	0.046	0.045	0.058	0.056	0.053	0.051
					MAF=0.2							
20	0.072	0.096	0.041	0.040	0.071	0.089	0.037	0.037	0.083	0.106	0.050	0.049
50	0.066	0.064	0.043	0.040	0.074	0.070	0.043	0.041	0.081	0.077	0.046	0.045
100	0.059	0.057	0.048	0.049	0.063	0.062	0.044	0.045	0.071	0.072	0.047	0.049
500	0.053	0.054	0.050	0.052	0.053	0.050	0.046	0.045	0.056	0.057	0.052	0.053
1000	0.052	0.051	0.049	0.049	0.051	0.050	0.050	0.047	0.056	0.051	0.052	0.050

Table 3

Type 1 error evaluation under simulation model 2 with 20% group uncertainty. *Superscript ^{BG} denotes TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} being applied to the "best-guess" genotype data. The true genotype data were masked using a Dirichlet distribution for the genotype probabilities with scale parameters a for the correct genotype and $(1-a)/2$ for the other two. On average $a = 0.8$ corresponds to 20% group uncertainty. See legend of Table 2 (main text) for additional simulation details.*

$n/2$	Gaussian				Student's t_4				χ^2_4			
	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}	TW^{BG}_{LAD}	TW_{LAD}	gS^{BG}_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}
					MAF=0.1							
20	0.082	0.100	0.039	0.036	0.082	0.102	0.039	0.040	0.096	0.117	0.048	0.048
50	0.080	0.074	0.045	0.046	0.093	0.081	0.046	0.049	0.105	0.093	0.047	0.049
100	0.064	0.062	0.048	0.050	0.084	0.075	0.049	0.050	0.090	0.082	0.050	0.051
500	0.049	0.052	0.046	0.047	0.062	0.060	0.051	0.052	0.060	0.060	0.049	0.050
1000	0.053	0.053	0.051	0.052	0.057	0.054	0.051	0.049	0.054	0.055	0.050	0.051
					MAF=0.2							
20	0.063	0.073	0.038	0.040	0.069	0.075	0.041	0.042	0.082	0.083	0.049	0.048
50	0.062	0.057	0.043	0.043	0.065	0.057	0.041	0.042	0.071	0.068	0.046	0.048
100	0.053	0.053	0.046	0.047	0.062	0.060	0.046	0.047	0.065	0.062	0.046	0.046
500	0.049	0.046	0.044	0.044	0.055	0.056	0.051	0.052	0.054	0.055	0.051	0.052
1000	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.048	0.050	0.052	0.054	0.050	0.050

Table 4

Type 1 error and power evaluation under simulation model 1 for singleton/pair combinations.

Comparing TW_{LAD} and gS_{LAD} across various singleton/pair combinations. The design setup follows simulation model 1 with equal number of singletons and/or pairs in the MZ and DZ groups. See Section 3.1 for simulation model 1 details.

σ_1^2	σ_2^2	TW_{LAD}	gS_{LAD}
		1000/0 Singletons/Pairs; n=1000	
1.0	1.0	0.053	0.053
1.1	1.0	0.169	0.168
1.2	1.0	0.476	0.475
		900/100 Singletons/Pairs; n=1100	
1.0	1.0	0.051	0.051
1.1	1.0	0.169	0.170
1.2	1.0	0.481	0.484
		0/1000 Singletons/Pairs; n=2000	
1.0	1.0	0.053	0.053
1.1	1.0	0.223	0.224
1.2	1.0	0.628	0.628



Figure 1. Empirical Type 1 error of generalized tests (location, scale and joint) for CF lung disease dataset. 10,000 permutation replicates of the lung function measures were generated from the full sample of Cystic Fibrosis patients including siblings (n=1507). For each replicate, the rs17563161 SNP genotype ($SLC9A3$) was analyzed directly using the generalized location ([a] gL), scale ([b] gS), and joint ([c] $gJLS$) tests. The location and scale tests were done under additive [df=1] and genotypic [df=2] genetic models, respectively. Resulting p-values are plotted as histograms and tested for deviation from a uniform distribution using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (p=0.71, 0.43 and 0.55 for (a), (b) and (c), respectively). See Section 4.2 for additional details.

References

Arnold, S. F. (1980). Asymptotic validity of F tests for the ordinary linear model and the multiple correlation model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **75,** 890–894.

Cameron, A. C. and Miller, D. L. (2013). A practitioners guide to cluster-robust inference. *Forthcoming in Journal of Human Resources* pages 221–236.

Carroll, R. J. and Schneider, H. (1985). A note on Levene's tests for equality of variances. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **3,** 191–194.

Furno, M. (2005). The Glejser test and the median regression. *Sankhy: The Indian Journal of Statistics* pages 335–358.

Godfrey, L. G. (1996). Some results on the Glejser and Koenker tests for heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* **72,** 275–299.

Iachine, I., Petersen, H. C., and Kyvik, K. O. (2010). Robust tests for the equality of variances for clustered data. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **80,** 365–377.

Im, K. S. (2000). Robustifying Glejser test of heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* **97,** 179–188.

Koenker, R. and Hallock, K. F. (2001). Quantile regression. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* **15,** 143–156.

Lehmann, E. L. and Romano, J. P. (2005). *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer texts in statistics. Springer, New York, 3rd edition.

Machado, J. A. F. and Silva, J. M. C. S. (2000). Glejser's test revisited. *Journal of Econometrics* **97,** 189–202.